Abstract: This paper explores rhetorical constructions of what the Roman emperor looked like, focusing on the apparently irreconcilable descriptions in Suetonius’ *Twelve Caesars* and in imperial portrait statues of the same men.
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Lenin’s corpse, Caligula’s body

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin died in 1924, but his embalmed body has been displayed in a mausoleum in Moscow’s Red Square for almost ninety years (fig. 1). This extraordinary act of preservation makes strong claims about Lenin’s appearance. In his memoir about caring for the body, Ilya Zbarsky explains that the embalmers did not try to make Lenin look younger (he was 53 when he died), more handsome, stronger or in some other way better than life. The point was to make him better than death. They tried to prevent signs of decomposition and produce a lifelike appearance of sleep. This mattered most for the visible parts of the body, the head and hands. Early work focused on reversing the corpse’s greenish-gray color and plumping up the shriveled ears; false eyeballs kept the eyes from appearing too sunken; the eyelids and mouth were sewn shut. Anything below the visible surface was fair game for transformation; not least, the entire body was regularly immersed in a mix of glycerine and potassium acetate. Keeping Lenin’s body looking unchanged and lifelike required continued efforts over decades. The result, an authentic Lenin available for public viewing in the mausoleum, was a rhetorical production. It was also an elaborate hybrid of the man’s actual remains, mechanical interventions, and chemical replacements—a material, embodied rhetoric. Lenin’s corpse made truth claims, many decades and chemicals later, about the actual appearance of the leader, claims that were politically and culturally situated. Zbarsky’s memoir is shot through with the political secrecy, repression and fear of the Soviet era, but it also makes clear the Soviet state’s pride in the team’s scientific achievement. Equally important was the ritualized public viewing and reception of
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1 I am grateful to Jas’ Elsner for his comments on the first draft of this text, to Ava Shirazi for her thoughts on rhetoric as a Roman institution, and to an audience of this paper in the Department of Classics at Stanford University for helpful criticisms and suggestions. All remaining shortcomings are my own. I wrote this paper in 2011 and 2012, unaware of Bill Gladhill’s article, “The Emperor’s No Clothes: Suetonius and the Dynamics of Corporeal Ecphrasis,” *CA* 31.2 (October 2012) 315-348.

2 Zbarsky and Hutchinson, 1998.

3 Zbarsky and Hutchinson, 1998: 21, 24, 30, 85.

4 For example, the removal of the corpse from Moscow during World War II allowed the embalmers more time to work on it: “so far as realism went, the face and hands of the corpse, which had been very pale before our work during the war, had taken a pinker, and thus more lifelike, tone” (Zbarsky and Hutchinson, 1998: 139; see also 121-122). On the regular glycerine and potassium acetate baths: p. 78.

5 Political machinations, arrests, and fear appear throughout the memoir, notably with the unexplained arrest and imprisonment of Zbarsky’s father in 1952 (pp. 157-171). But, thanks to their success with Lenin’s body, his embalmers were asked to work on other Communist rulers, including only
Lenin’s corpse. His body, in its carefully lit presentation in the mausoleum on Red Square, provided an important way to focus political veneration. Over the years, millions of ordinary people waited in long lines to view the body and had to follow rules for respectful behavior once inside the building. Visiting dignitaries paid their respects there; Soviet leaders stood on top of the mausoleum to review parades. Lenin’s body was a potent symbol. Not coincidentally, since the Soviet Union’s dissolution in 1991, there has been ongoing debate about whether to remove Lenin’s body from view and bury it.

Lenin’s body offers a revealing way into the subject of this paper: rhetorical constructions of what the Roman emperor looked like. Similar issues of mimetic representation, public reception and symbolic force inform a rich element of Roman culture in the early and middle Imperial period: visual and textual representations of the emperor’s physical appearance. Describing how the emperor looked was apparently a meaningful thing to do. The statues of Augustus, Vespasian, Trajan or any other first or second century CE emperor depict recognizable and lifelike individuals, each with his own facial traits and hairstyle. In the fullest surviving textual counterpart, Suetonius’ Twelve Caesars, the author describes the individual appearance of each his subjects in unusual detail. These images and texts made strong claims about how the Roman emperor actually looked, claims that, as for Lenin’s lifelike corpse, operated within a specific political and technological context.

These claims are all the more striking because the visual and textual representations do not match. Both Suetonius’ Twelve Caesars and portrait statues of the same rulers claim to represent what the individual emperors looked like. However, they do not say the same thing. Take, for example, Caligula. Suetonius describes him like this (Gaius, 50):  

\[
\text{Statura fuit eminenti, colore expallido, corpore enormi, gracilitate maxima cervicis et crurum, oculis et temporibus concavis, fronte lata et torva, capillo rare at circa verticem nullo, hirsutus cetera. Quare transeunte eo prospicere ex superiore parte aut omnino quacumque de causa capram nominare, criminosum et exitiale habebatur. Vultum vero natura horridum ac taetrum etiam ex industria efferabat componens ad speculum in omnem terrorem ac formidinem.}
\]

He was very tall and extremely pale, with an unshapely body, but very thin neck and legs. His eyes and temples were hollow, his forehead broad and grim, his hair thin and entirely gone on the top of this head, though his body was hairy. Because of this to look upon him from a higher place as he passed by, or for any reason whatever to mention a goat, was treated as a capital offence. While his

Stalin but also dead leaders from Bulgaria, Mongolia, Czechoslovakia, North Vietnam, Angola, Guyana and North Korea (Zbarsky and Hutchinson, 1998: 172-190). Since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the embalmers’ best clients have been murdered Russian gangsters (191-207).

6 Tumarkin 1997: esp. xi-xii, 194-95, 261, 267. She puts the total number of visitors in the “tens of millions” (267). On the role of the cult of personality, and on predecessors to this veneration of a dead leader: 4-23.

7 Weir 2011. He notes that a website (www.goodbyelenin.ru) set up by the United Russia party invites Russians to vote on whether Lenin should be buried. On April 17, 2012, 66.71% of the 347,032 votes were in favor.

8 All citations and translations of Suetonius are from the Loeb edition (Rolfe 1998 and 1997).
face was naturally forbidding and ugly, he purposely made it even more savage, practising all kinds of terrible and fearsome expressions before a mirror.

Suetonius emphasizes this body’s disproportion. Caligula’s forms and shapes were ugly; even his hair grew in all the wrong places, with not enough on his head and too much everywhere else. In this account, the princeps even intensified his unpleasant appearance by making faces in the mirror. By contrast, visual representations of Caligula show very little of this ugliness. On coins, he is depicted with large eyes, but that is a recurrent feature of Julio-Claudian dynastic portraiture and not specific to this ruler. Neither his eyes nor his temples appear particularly hollow; his neck does not look particularly thin, and he has a normal amount and distribution of hair. The portrait sculptures are even more distant from Suetonius’ account (fig. 2, 3, 4). They show Caligula with plenty of hair, unremarkable temples and a reasonably sized neck. His eyes are large but not especially hollow; there is no sign of unusual height, spindly legs, or copious body hair. Rather, his full-length statues depict a standard, well-proportioned body (fig. 3, 4).

How to reconcile these contradictory versions of how the emperor looked? Previous studies have tried to resolve these differences in three main ways. A first approach is to treat the relationship of these textual and visual descriptions as a problem of evidence for how the ruler actually looked. Studies of written biography or visual portraiture sometimes refer to elements from the other medium to analyze and verify the ruler’s appearance. Suetonius writes, for example, that Augustus’ nose “projected a little at the top and then bent slightly inward” \((nasum et a summo eminentiorem et ab imo deductiorem; Aug. 79)\), and this may match the carved noses of the Alcudia, Louvre MA 1280 and Prima Porta portrait types, with their slight bump on the upper bridge (fig. 5). The difficulty is that only a few features can be matched directly in this way. Suetonius’ account of Augustus’ “calm and mild” expression \(vultu…tranquillo serenoque; Aug. 79)\) is much harder to relate to the visual portraits, and other traits do not cross genres at all. Suetonius writes that Augustus had skin blemishes, a weak left leg and an itchy body \(Aug. 80)\). By contrast, the portrait statues of Augustus portray a man of physical strength and health, with smooth, unblemished skin (fig. 6).
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9 von Kaenel 1989, with plates A-E.
10 Only two full-length figures of Caligula survive, reproduced here in figs. 3 and 4. Fig. 3 is a togate statue, \(capite velato\), found in the agora of Gortyn in 1885, marble, 2.05m high, now in the Gortyn Aquarium, inv. GO 16 (Boschung 1989: cat. 8, p. 109 and plates 8.1-3 and 41.1-2; Rome and Portale 1998: 331-36, cat. 8, pl. XLIII, with extensive bibliography and discussion of other Julio-Claudian portraits found in the same zone). Fig. 4 is a togate statue with the head uncovered, marble, 2.03m high, said to have been found at the Theater of Marcellus in Rome. Previously in the Palazzo Colonna in Rome, since 1971 it has been in the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond, Virginia, acc. no. 71.20. (Boschung 1989: cat. 11, pp. 109-110 and pls. 42-43, with detail views of the head on pl. 11).
12 In his magisterial study of the sculpted portraits of Augustus, Dietrich Boschung examines the literary evidence for the princeps’ appearance to measure the extent to which the visual portraits were stylized (Boschung 1993: 93-96). This still implies that the written descriptions can be use as a reference for good information on this point.
A second approach has been to stress the functional differences between historical writing and visual portraiture; portrait statues were strongly honorific, while the written sources were often not. So, for Caligula, we might interpret the statues as flattering versions of his actual appearance, which Suetonius depicts more accurately. However, this does not solve the larger problem, since the mismatch extends well beyond the case of Caligula and includes good emperors as well as bad. No Roman statue shows a ruler with the physical problems described for Augustus, with a protruding belly and blotchy body (Nero, 51), or bad feet and bow legs (Otho, 12). These written physicalities, so unflattering and specific, seem to have little to do with the idealizing ways in which the emperors were visually portrayed.

In light of these difficulties, a third, more recent approach shows increasing scepticism about drawing on the visual evidence at all to illuminate the written descriptions, or vice-versa. These scholars emphasize the distances between Suetonius’ descriptions and portrait statuary, and the impossibility of bridging them. For example, Suetonius does not seem to have drawn on visual sources for his descriptions of appearance; his references were primarily textual. Yet the second century CE audience for Suetonius’ biographies lived among ubiquitous visual depictions of past and present emperors, in coinage, public statuary and other media. Apparently, in their own context, these discrepancies were not considered a problem. This encourages a reframing of the question. How did these apparently irreconcilable visual and textual representations—each claiming authority and truth about the appearance of the emperor—make sense to their audiences? And how did they relate to one another?

In this paper, I suggest that exploring the rhetorical aspects of appearance in both Suetonius’ biographies and imperial portrait statuary helps explain how these apparently divergent claims worked within the same cultural and historical milieu. Suetonius’ relationship to rhetorical training and forms of expression has received scholarly attention, but the relationship between visual portraiture and rhetoric less so. Accordingly, I begin with a discussion of Suetonius’ descriptions of appearance in *The Twelve Caesars* in relation to the rhetoric of praise and blame, drawing on the work of Tamsyn Barton and others. Then, I consider first century CE imperial portrait statues in light of the rhetorical model proposed by Jas’ Elsner and Michel Meyer in this volume’s introduction, exploring *ethos, pathos* and *logos* as concepts that help illuminate the

---

14 Wardman 1967; Wardle 1994: 325-26. Wardman points out that Suetonius mentions statues, but not in relation to appearance; statues are present as omens, honors, and evidence for political attitudes or imperial arrogance vs. restraint.
15 Jas’ Elsner offers an intriguing way forward in his comparison of the physiognomist and orator Polemo’s highly specific and detailed description of Favorinus with Favorinus’ portrait statue in Corinth, which does not survive but was almost certainly a standard honorific statue employing a stock body (Elsner 2007). Here there is a disjunction between textual and visual description that cannot be directly bridged. Even Polemon’s very positive description of Hadrian, with its emphasis on the extraordinary color and power of the emperor’s eyes, cannot be matched up well with sculpted portraits. Interestingly, Elsner is more optimistic about the potential impact of art on physiognomics, citing Polemo’s emphasis on certain physical features and disregard of others, and his use of color. I will come back to related possibilities at the end of this paper.
persuasive nature and mechanisms of this visual imagery. Ultimately, this will allow a return to the relationship between Suetonius’s descriptions and portrait statues of the same individuals, and to the question of how they interacted within the same broader cultural context.

A central theme is that these representations of appearance, and their reception, were fundamentally shaped by their different media and genres. At the same time, these texts and images shared underlying concerns about defining, characterizing and assessing the power of the ruler. In this sense, they demonstrate the rich malleability of descriptions of appearance, and suggest the range of work that descriptions of physical appearance could perform. This discussion makes clear that there was no concept in Roman culture of a single or objectively “true” appearance for any given person, in the modern sense of what someone actually looks like. Descriptions of appearance are culturally constructed and vary greatly across place and time. In both image and text, representations of the Roman ruler took shape as an embodied rhetoric—as much for the Roman emperor in the first century CE as in the preservation of Lenin’s body in the twentieth.

Suetonius’ descriptions of the ruler’s appearance

Every one of Suetonius’ biographies in The Twelve Caesars describes the ruler’s physical appearance: Julius 45, Augustus 79-80, Tiberius 68, Gaius 50, Claudius 30, Nero 51, Galba 21, Otho 12, Vitellius 17, Vespasian 20, Titus 3, and Domitian 18. Such descriptions had precedents in ancient biography, but their systematic inclusion and level of detail seem to have been unique to Suetonius. For the reader or listener encountering these biographies in order, physical description became a predictable element, like the attention paid to ancestors and the father’s career at the start of each life. In the first of the twelve, for example, Julius Caesar is physically described about halfway through, after the accounts of his public life and deeds and at the start of a discussion of his domestic life and personal qualities. At this transitional point, the author promises to review “his personal appearance, his dress, his mode of life, and his character, as well as his conduct in civil and military life” (ea quae ad formam et habitum et cultum et mores, nec minus quae ad civilia et bellica eius studia pertineant; Julius 44). Here, the syntactical series, et...et...et, makes physical appearance one of several equally revealing aspects of Julius’ character and education. The passage emphasizes their functional equivalence; personal appearance is one part of constructing a biography and understanding its subject. This sets the tone for physical descriptions throughout the work.

These were not “photographic” or neutral descriptions of how a person looked; their primary goal was not recognizability. The latter kind of description did exist, but in specific contexts; A.E. Wardman notes that their goal was to identify people like runaway

slaves and errant taxpayers, and those descriptions accordingly emphasized features that would allow immediate recognition.\textsuperscript{19} Biography had other goals. In Suetonius, the description of physical appearance contributed to the larger narrative about a ruler’s character and the assessment of his deeds. Several scholars have pointed out how much Suetonius’ biographies owe to rhetorical training and ways of thinking, in particular epideictic, the praise or blame of persons.\textsuperscript{20} In particular, Tamsyn Barton offers a detailed analysis of Suetonius as rhetorician, showing how the structures and tropes of encomium were reversed to create a very negative assessment of Nero.\textsuperscript{21}

Especially useful here is Barton’s discussion of the embroidery or even outright invention of what happened in the service of \textit{enargeia}, or vivid description. So, for example, colorful details flesh out accusations of vice or depraved behavior, and those details are themselves often \textit{topoi} of invective. Some examples: Nero’s early tutors are said (not surprisingly) to have been very low status, a dancer and a barber (\textit{Nero} 6); Nero robbed temples (\textit{Nero} 32); Nero’s sexual behavior inverted—to put it mildly—standard expectations of elite masculinity (esp. \textit{Nero} 28-29). Barton also points out that Suetonius seems deliberately to frame these details in relation to one another, building from mild sexual debauchery to an appalling peak, with a similar trajectory for Nero’s cruelty. This has immediate implications for scholarship: “Clearly the acceptability of this sort of elaboration on standard lines poses problems for historians hoping to extract kernels of truth from Suetonius. The tradition should not be taken on trust.”\textsuperscript{22} These gruesome details are presented as part of an evaluation built up through rhetorical techniques and expectations, not as objective fact.

Barton’s analysis is extremely helpful in analyzing Suetonius’ descriptions of personal appearance, and indeed, they seem to work in a very similar way. The physical descriptions are primarily concerned with praise and blame, and with the assessment of a ruler’s character and deeds; they are not neutral depictions of what a ruler actually looked like. We can see tropes of encomium or invective, while the most vivid details are probably best understood as serving the purposes of \textit{enargeia} rather than factual reality. Their structure and context are crucial, with different rhetorical effects depending on what aspects of appearance are described and how, where a description is placed within the narrative, and how it relates to the rest of a ruler’s life.

Most obviously, Suetonius’ good rulers are generally pleasing in appearance and the bad rulers are not; the worst can be downright hideous. Caligula, the most insane of these twelve, has an awful appearance, as already seen. Augustus and Titus, the best of the bunch, are also the best looking, with relatively minor flaws (Augustus’ bad teeth, Titus’ protruding belly) placed within a harmonious whole. This difference extends to the kind and amount of detail included. Typical elements of Suetonius’ descriptions

\textsuperscript{19} Wardman 1967: 414, with further discussion in Evans 1969: 51-52. Misener 1924 is an extended exploration of this “iconistic” kind of description. Couissin notes that this is not a question of the quality of evidence available to Suetonius; if it were, we would expect the most detailed descriptions to be of the most recent emperors, seen in living memory, but this is not the case (Couissin 1953: 235).

\textsuperscript{20} For example, Andrew Wallace-Hadrill has analyzed Suetonius’ treatment of his rulers’ stock panoply of virtues or vices in this light (Wallace-Hadrill 1983: 144). However, Wallace-Hadrill also points out that Suetonius does not follow the rhetorical handbooks’ focus on courage, justice, temperance and wisdom in particular, but pursues his own emphases.

\textsuperscript{21} Barton 1994.

\textsuperscript{22} Barton 1994: 58.
include height and to what extent the body is in proportion or not. If a ruler was well-proportioned, this is mentioned in positive but vague terms. Augustus has an “unusually handsome” figure (*forma fuit eximia*) with “fine proportion and symmetry” (*commoditate et aequitate membrorum*; *Aug.* 79). Similarly, Titus’ “bodily and mental gifts were conspicuous” (*corporis animique dotes exsplenduerunt*; *Titus* 3) and he had a “handsome person” (*forma egregia*, *Titus* 3). When the body is not well-proportioned (usually the sign of a bad ruler), specific problems are described in much more detail, as in the example of Caligula cited above, or Nero, who had a thick neck, protruding belly, and skinny legs (*cervice obesa, ventre proiecto, gracillimis cruribus*; *Nero* 51).23 *Enargeia* here plays a role in communicating the overall praise-blameworthiness of a ruler. Caligula’s practice of making faces in the mirror to intensify his own fearsomeness can be understood in this light; the point is not whether or not he actually did this, but that the vivid detail heightens the interweaving of his physical and ethical ugliness.

These correlations between appearance and character have raised the question of Suetonius’ relationship to the ancient physiognomic handbooks. Physiognomic ideas are visible in the attention sometimes given to the color and brilliance of the eyes (e.g. *Julius* 45, *Aug.* 79, *Tib.* 68). Caligula’s goat-like appearance (*Gaius* 50) links him to the lascivious and other negative connotations of the goat in physiognomic writings; Augustus, by contrast, can be associated with the positive connotations of the eagle or the lion (*Aug.* 79-80).24 However, other descriptions in Suetonius cannot be linked as strongly to physiognomic ideas; a physiognomic framework is not dominant in Suetonius, or even consistently employed.25 It may make more sense to read the physiognomic references in Suetonius primarily as tropes of invective or encomium, additional fuel for the construction of praise or blame through physical description.

For example, Suetonius sometimes establishes correlations between appearance and character only to explode them later on. Claudius was considered incompetent and lacking in potential as a child and young man, largely on the basis of his physical defects (*Claudius* 2, 4); the point here is that physiognomic expectations were confounded by Claudius’ good performance as emperor. Similarly, the short-lived emperor Otho stands out for his heroism in death, contradicting his dissipated life and his unprepossessing appearance: “neither Otho’s person nor his bearing suggested such great courage” (*tanto Othonis animo nequaquam corpus aut habitus competit*; *Otho* 12). As Fabio Stok points out, the oppositions in Otho’s biography are quite broad, balancing a corrupt life with a courageous death as much as they invert physiognomic expectations.26

---


26 Stok 1995, *pace* Couissin 1953: 236. Stok further notes that appearance is not fixed or unchangeable. Germanicus, endowed with a perfect character and almost perfect appearance at the start of
The placement and context of the descriptions within individual biographies strengthens these effects. Some of these placements seem to be about stylistic \textit{variatio} more than character: Augustus’ physical description, like Julius’, is grouped with other aspects of his personal life (marriages, children, sexual rumors, bodily habits), but at the end of these rather than at the start, with no substantial change in impact. Others are more clearly about evaluating the ruler: Caligula’s starkly negative appearance counterbalances the very positive description of the beloved Germanicus near the start of that biography (\textit{Gaius} 3). The placement of Vitellius’ description heightens the public shame of his downfall and death; it is only once Vitellius is being dragged along the Sacred Way, mocked from all sides, that the reader is told that “he was in fact abnormally tall, with a face usually flushed from hard drinking, a huge belly, and one thigh crippled” (\textit{erat enim in eo enormis proceritas, facies rubida plerumque ex vinulentia, venter obesus, alterum femur subdebile, Vitellius 17}). In the very next sentence, Vitellius is killed and dumped in the Tiber. The disproportion and vivid detail of his description make clear that this is no positive or image or neutral description; its placement makes the reader or listener a participant in Vitellius’ humiliation.

Tiberius’ appearance, placed near the end of his biography, encapsulates in physical terms the contradictory character seen in his life and deeds. Like his reign, the description begins well; he is “large and strong of frame, and of a stature above the average; broad of shoulders and chest; well proportioned and symmetrical from head to foot” (\textit{corpore fuit ampio atque robusto, statura quae iustam excederet; latus ab umeris et pectore, ceteris quoque membris usque ad imos pedes aequalis et congruens; Tib. 68}). However, this pleasing proportion deteriorates very fast, in the very next sentence. “His left hand was the more nimble and stronger, and its joints were so powerful that he could bore through a fresh, sound apple with his finger, and break the head of a boy, or even a young man, with a snap of it” (\textit{sinistra manu agiliore ac validiore, articulis ita firmis, ut recens et integrum malum digito terebraret, caput pueri vel etiam adolescentis talitro vulneraret; Tib. 68}). In this sinister crescendo, the left hand takes on freakish strength; its potential violence escalates to the killing of a boy and then a grown man. This escalation parallels Tiberius’ deeds in life: “little by little he unmasked the ruler” (\textit{paulatim principem exseruit, Tib. 33}), while his praiseworthy violence against Rome’s enemies (\textit{Tib.} 9, 16) is now increasingly turned against Romans (37), from children (43, 44) through youths (his own grandsons, 54) to grown men (55, 56, 58, especially 61).

To sum up this brief discussion: Suetonius’ physical descriptions did not offer what in modern terms might be called a photographic sense of a person’s appearance; they cannot be taken as reliable indicators of a ruler actually looked like. Instead, their emphases, arrangements, and even particular details primarily communicated an ethical assessment of the ruler in question, framed in rhetorical terms of praise or blame. The descriptions’ placement within a given biography, the details of what was described in relation to the rest of the life, and the similarities and contrasts from one ruler to another shaped their impact. Suetonius’ descriptions made truth claims not about how an
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\textsuperscript{27} Stok 1995.
\textsuperscript{28} Evans notes this (1969: 55-56), though she does not discuss his left hand.
emperor really looked, but ultimately explained how his actions and motivations in the past might properly be understood and assessed in the present.

**The rhetoric of appearance in imperial portrait statuary**

Keeping Suetonius in mind as a rhetorician of appearance, I turn now to imperial portrait statues and to some preliminary observations about their shaping conventions. These will then help ground their analysis in terms of Elsner’s and Meyer’s rhetorical model. As in Suetonius, these visual descriptions of appearance were not intended to provide a photorealistic representation of the ruler, despite the crucial structural role played by recognizable individuality. Rather, these portraits were fundamentally about persuasion in relation to social power.\(^{29}\) Imperial portrait statuary was rhetorical in that its purpose was to honor the ruler portrayed; in this sense, it made an argument and attempted to persuade. Here again, the force of this portraiture was most closely related to epideictic, or the praise and blame of an individual. But, by contrast to Suetonius’ biographies, honorific portraiture was about encomium and did not include invective. This does not exclude a strong relationship to how the emperor “really” looked in a modern sense, but it does change the analytical goals. Caligula’s portraits cannot be analyzed for clues to his failings; we will not find Suetonius’ fearsome features and expressions here.\(^{30}\) This portraiture was created to thank, glorify or otherwise praise the person depicted, and, by definition, did not include negative characterizations. Other visual genres, e.g. graffiti, could of course exercise more freedom, and invective might be expressed later on in the life of a portrait, most dramatically in attacks on visual representations of specific individuals, but the surviving portraits in marble and bronze were produced to praise rather than blame the portrayed ruler.

At the same time, the rules of medium and genre fundamentally shaped these images. Imperial portrait statues followed the structural conventions of honorific portraiture, with certain exceptions (e.g. colossal portraits). A male honorific statue was normally slightly over lifesize, between 2m and 2.20m, meaning that the height of a statue was unrelated to the height of the person portrayed. The two best-preserved portrait statues of Caligula, for example, stand 2.05m and 2.03m high (fig. 3 and 4).\(^{31}\) A second fundamental convention was the combination of an individualized head with a stock body. This kind of juxtaposition can seem jarring to modern eyes, as in the famous example of the 1st c. BCE Tivoli General, on which middle-aged, careworn facial features are combined with a nearly-nude, heroic body.\(^{32}\) In a Roman context, however, this was standard and expected. These two statues of Caligula, for example, combine portrait heads with generic bodies, well-proportioned and dressed in the toga, standing in a balanced pose with the weight on one foot and the other drawn slightly back—such bodies could be used for any senatorial Roman male. Much more restricted in its use and monarchic in its connotations, but sharing the same structural principles, was the body of
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\(^{29}\) Previous studies investigating Greco-Roman portraiture in relation to rhetorical concepts and persuasion include Giuliani 1986 and Stewart 1993. These, however, focus on formal aspects, and especially the heads; my emphasis below is somewhat different.

\(^{30}\) Noted by Gross 1982: 205.

\(^{31}\) Findspot, current location, and bibliography for these two statues are at n. 10, above.

\(^{32}\) On the relationships of head and body in statuary, Stewart 2003: 53 and ch. 2; see also Trimble 2011: ch. 4. On the visual and cultural meanings of the nude male body in Roman art, Hallett 2005.
Zeus/Jupiter as combined, for example, with the portrait head of Claudius in the Metroon at Olympia (fig. 8). These statue bodies never represented the actual body of the person portrayed—a convention that was clearly understood by ancient audiences—meaning that an individual’s bodily characteristics like skin trouble or old injuries did not appear in the visual portraiture.

The stock body of an honorific statue usefully connected the individual to larger social or symbolic categories. These categories could include gender and age (shown by body shape, clothing and sometimes size), high social status (postures of physical ease, high-quality cloth elegantly draped, the achievement of having an honorific portrait statue at all), and specific social roles such as citizen (through a Roman toga or Greek himation). In the case of the princeps, this meant the facial features and hairstyle were specific to one man, but from the neck down, the statue consisted of a generic body in one of several stock guises: dressed in a citizen’s or magistrate’s toga, wearing the armor and a military cloak of a military commander, represented in heroic nudity, and so on. So, for example, the bodies used in Caligula’s two statues represent adult males wearing the full citizen toga and senatorial shoes. The portrait from Gortyn in addition depicts him capite velato, with a fold of the toga pulled over his head to mark religious action; his missing right hand held a patera (fig. 3). Caligula is here portrayed as a high-ranking Roman citizen performing a religious ritual; the elements of this body could be employed for other men as well, and in this way the generic elements of the Gortyn statue tied Caligula into a broader ideology of civic leadership and pietas.

Given these strong conventions, it is no surprise that Suetonius’ bodily asymmetries and weaknesses are not seen in the portrait statuary. But the head of a portrait statue, the most individualized and apparently mimetic part, was also strongly constrained by medium and genre; a photorealistic representation was not the primary goal here either. The portraits of Augustus famously repeated a consistent set of features and hairstyle that did not change with the increasing age of the princeps over the four decades and more of his rule (fig. 5 and 6). Sculpted portraits continued to depict him in an idealized young adulthood; individualizing traits like slightly projecting ears and an aquiline nose were combined with a classicizing bone structure and smooth skin. The most reliable identifier of a portrait of Augustus is the consistent arrangement of the “crab claw” locks of hair on his forehead, but this feature seems to be unique to the visual portraiture and his hair is treated very differently in the written sources. This tells us less about Augustus’ actual appearance than about the way in which this visually portrayed hairstyle took on importance and meaning within its own medium and genre. For example, Dietrich Boschung has argued that in group portraits, this hairstyle became


34 Niemeyer 1968.

35 Boschung 1993.

36 Suetonius describes a very different situation, stressing Augustus’ lack of care about his hair and the haste he imposed on his barbers (Aug. 79). Other ancient writings on Augustus’ appearance don’t mention his hair at all. The sources are discussed in Boschung 1993: 93-96.
a visual symbol shared by, and indicating, Augustus’ designated successors. In a related phenomenon, numerous members of the Julio-Claudian dynasty were portrayed with large eyes and very similar bone structure; these make them difficult for modern commentators to identify, but in their own time usefully created visual and ideological connections between the members of the ruling house. In turn, a change of dynasty could be signalled in strong visual ways, including by a strong change in the style or other aspects of how the ruler’s features were portrayed.

This brief review raises a further question: how can we understand the rhetorical workings of this statuary more deeply and richly? Jas’ Elsner’s and Michel Meyer’s rhetorical model of art, set out in this volume’s introduction, offers a very helpful way forward. Elsner and Meyer explore three different means of persuasion, working with concepts of ethos, pathos and logos as these might be applied to the study of a work of art. Very briefly, in ancient rhetoric, ethos as a means of persuasion related to the good character of the speaker and the ways that character could be established in a speech with persuasive results; pathos concerned the receptivity of the audience and the speaker’s ways of shaping the emotional impact of a speech; logos involved the content of the speech itself. Below, I draw on Elsner’s and Meyer’s discussion of these to consider selected aspects of imperial portrait statuary. These three concepts usefully situate the power of the images in relation to persuasion while also providing a way of thinking about how an imperial portrait statue did its persuasive work.

For the sake of argument and brevity, I will focus here on the dedicators of statuary in relation to ethos, on spatial and ritual contexts in relation to pathos, and on the formal and symbolic construction of the figure in my discussion of logos. However, all of these overlap and interact, and many additional aspects of imperial portrait statuary could also be considered in these terms. My discussion will assume that an imperial portrait statue can consist not only of an individualized head and stock body, but also any accompanying inscription, associated portraits, the physical setting, and the ritual and spatial shaping of the audience’s viewing. One further note: in talking about these works as rhetorical, it is difficult to avoid talking about the images themselves as agents, e.g., a statue makes claims about the credibility of its dedicator, works on the viewers’ state of mind, aims to persuade viewers about the identity of the ruler, and so on. A theoretical discussion of this problem is beyond my scope in this paper, but briefly stated, I am following recent scholarship that treats images as powerful but the relevant agency as human, expressed through the shaping, installation and reception of images by social actors.

Ethos

---

38 The portrait heads of Vespasian famously employ a much more veristic style than the Julio-Claudians’ did; among other things, their detailed facial wrinkles and fleshy sags express a useful ideological distance from the reign of Nero.
39 The ultimate source of this triad is Aristotle, On Rhetoric, 1.2.3-6 and 2.1, with further elaboration at 2.2-11 (character), 2.12-17 (emotions), 2.18-26 (techniques of persuasion). I am indebted here to Kennedy 2007.
40 The fullest theoretical exploration is Gell 1998, with a critical discussion and applied case studies for Classical art (and others) in Osborne and Tanner 2007.
The maker of an image was not normally present when the work was viewed; rather, the artwork itself had to make any persuasive claims, including about the identity and credibility of the maker. Elsner and Meyer note that the maker could include designers, artists and patrons, i.e. whoever was responsible for an artwork’s existence, appearance, and persuasive aspects. They frame the concept of *ethos* accordingly:

> From the point of view adopted here, ethos is a claim to the capacity or expertise or virtues necessary to respond, to give an appropriate or just answer to a question raised in the debate or simply in social interaction. Ethos is supremely the marker of authority to speak, write or produce images and buildings – it is a claim made in doing any of these things.\(^{41}\)

This formulation encourages us to look both for the source of authority in image-making and also for the ways in which that authority is communicated through the artwork itself.\(^{42}\) It suggests that imperial portrait statues not only demonstrated the good character and credible authority of the persons responsible for presenting them, but that this character and authority also helped make the statue persuasive. And, somehow, this claim did not rely solely on the presence or prior reputation of the person responsible but was part of the artwork.

In the most immediate sense, an imperial portrait statue expressed to viewers the authority of the ruler portrayed, his authority to occupy public space in that supreme role. This was accomplished by the recognizability of the portrait head, its juxtaposition with an appropriate body type and any inscription or accompanying dynastic portraits, the prestige of the space it was installed in, and the viewers’ prior familiarity with the conventions of public imperial portraiture. Indeed, for most viewers, portrait statues and other images of the emperor were probably as close as they ever got to the ruler. An image of the emperor was vested with certain kinds of representative authority, physically able to stand in for the emperor’s person and perform certain kinds of work: to act as a site of oath-taking, a place of asylum, a locus for demonstrating loyalty or betraying treason.\(^{43}\) In a very real sense, the ethos of the portrait and the ethos of the ruler were the same.

But this ethos also extended to the dedicator of a statue. For an imperial portrait statue, the person responsible for making and installing an imperial portrait statue was not normally the ruler portrayed. As for any statue or other public honor, the honorific economy required that someone else formally make the honoring gesture. This relational aspect of honorific portraiture meant that the portrait authorized not only its model (the princeps) but also its dedicator. Multiple people were responsible for making and installing an imperial portrait statue, including the sculptor of the portrait head type that was then replicated in portraits around the Empire, the carvers of any given portrait statue, and the dedicator(s) of that statue, responsible for its final installation and viewing. Sculptors were generally not named in the evidence, but the dedicators often claimed responsibility in an accompanying inscription. The dedicators made an explicit

\(^{41}\) This volume, p. XX

\(^{42}\) I am grateful to Jas’ Elsner for discussion of the relationship between the ethos of the ruler portrayed and the ethos of the dedicator.

\(^{43}\) Instances are collected in Boschung 2002: 168-171.
and rhetorical gesture: I/we install this statue here, in my/our name, to honor the ruler. In this way, the patron can be considered a maker of the statue, and the ethos of imperial portrait statues expanded accordingly.

Dietrich Boschung explains who dedicated statues of Augustus and why. In Rome and elsewhere, they were put up by the Senate, by his family and close associates, and by individual members of the Roman elite. Throughout the provinces, statues were erected by a city’s decurions or by private citizens, sometimes in groups; the imperial statues in the Cuicul Forum (fig. 9), for example, were mostly dedicated by the city’s decurions. The accompanying inscriptions, when they provided a reason, expressed gratitude for Augustus’ patronage, military successes, and the conditions that allowed commerce to prosper, among other things. These patterns continued for Augustus’ successors. C. Brian Rose’s study of 130 Julio-Claudian portrait groups shows that the largest number of recorded dedicators, more than fifty, were cities or their official representative bodies (decurions, senate and people, or council in the Latin West; the demos, boule and/or polis in the Greek East). Eight more were dedicated by individual magistrates, from local duoviri up to a consul; another twelve were commissioned by civic priests and priestly groups, including Augustales, neopoioi, and magistri. Three were dedicated by members of the ruling regime and two dedications were by regional organizations, the Amphictyonic League and the koinon of Asia. A less official group is an association of doctors at Velia in Campania (Rose’s cat. 49), while ten dedications were by persons not acting in an official capacity, including imperial freedmen, a soldier, and family groups.

The portrait statues communicated the ethos of these dedicators in several ways. Above all, they described and demonstrated the dedicators’ social authority. In the accompanying inscriptions, dedicators are sometimes listed with their formal titles, making the installation of portraits of the ruling family an occasion for the display of their own careers. At Cuicul, which flourished in the later second and early third centuries CE, a typical formula for the dedication of an imperial portrait statue in the Forum was d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica) (bases 1, 16, 37, 42 and 44 on fig. 9). Dedicating a statue could do more than describe a career; it also legitimized the office and the officeholder. Dedications by Augustales not only honored the founder of their priesthood and his family, but also showed the priests properly fulfilling the role enabled by the ruler in the first place. As aedile at Segobriga in Hispania Tarraconensis, Lucius Turellius Geminus installed statues of Drusus the Younger and Germanicus, demonstrating his own energy in that civic role and ensuring that it was remembered beyond his actual term of office.

Turellius’ installation was done at his own expense, “d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia).” This kind of public generosity was a further way to establish the dedicators’ good character and credible authority. At Herculaneum, the will of a soldier named Seneca, who had belonged to the thirteenth urban cohort, provided a cash handout of four sesterces per
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45 Rose 1997. This sample must lean heavily toward the wealthier and more powerful end of the patronage scale, since these are group dedications rather than individual statues; they required more money, authorization and other resources than single statue dedications did.
46 Zimmer 1989: p. 20 and inscriptions C1, C16, C37, C42 and C44.
person in conjunction with statue dedications of Augustus and Claudius. Similarly, at
Trebuta Suffenas in Latium, three freedmen distributed cakes and wine to the people
(crustulum et mulsum dederunt) in connection with a dedication of imperial portrait
statues. Gifts like this, added to the costs of the portrait statues, showed the dedicator to
be generous and civic-minded, as well as properly honorific toward the ruling family.

The dedicator’s ethos was expressed in spatial terms as well; certain locations
were especially prestigious. As a rule, imperial statue groups were installed in the most
visible and prestigious of public spaces, including fora and agorai, basilicae, and
sanctuaries; each statue was a demonstration of the dedicator’s privileged access and
power to shape that space. At Cuicul, the western half of the Forum in front of the
basilica was the most prestigious space, judging by the preponderance of imperial portrait
statues; fifteen inscribed bases attest to imperial statuary there, by contrast to only four
imperial figures among the statue bases on the east side of the square (fig. 9). At Eresus
on the island of Lesbos, in thanks for a victory of Augustus probably in 8 CE, an
unnamed donor built a sanctuary and temple for the sons of Augustus “in the most
prominent part of the agora” ([ Stateless inscription records a range
of Augustus and Claudius
of the emperor’s approval
of the proposed honors. Sometimes the emperor refused some of the proposals while
commending the rest, suggesting that a city had to be extremely thoughtful about the
right number and kind of honors to propose. At Gytheum, an inscription records a range
of honors for Augustus, Livia and Tiberius, as well as Tiberius’ response: he commends
the city and accepts all the honors proposed for Augustus, as befitting his benefactions
and appropriately godlike, but adds, in a rhetoric modulation of his own, “but I myself am
satisfied with honors more modest and more human” (aEtUw d€ rkoEmai ta-w
metrivt“raiw te ka- enyrop€oiw). In this symbolic exchange, the stakes could be very

48 Rose 1997: cat. 15, pp. 91-92.
49 Rose 1997: cat. 47, pp. 119-120.
50 Two of the imperial bases on the east side had special positions flanking the entrance into the
Curia (Zimmer 1989: pp. 20-21, 32; bases 1 and 3 on fig. 9 in the present paper).
51 Rose 1997: cat. 84, pp. 151-152.
52 Rose 1997: cat. 95, pp. 158-159. Depictions of Julio-Claudian portrait groups on coins produced
by local vs. imperial mints offer an interesting parallel (Boschung 2002: 158-167).
53 Rose 1997: 74, with examples in cat. 71, 83, 100 and others.
54 Rose 1997: cat. 74, pp. 142-144. Similarly, in a letter written in 41 CE to the city of Alexandria,
the emperor Claudius accepted almost all the proposed honors but turned down the establishment of
high. The city of Cyzicus seems to have lost its freedom in part for dragging its feet with regard to honors to Augustus, and a new dedication of portrait statues of Augustus, Tiberius and Claudius seems to have been an attempt to get back into favor. In other words, there were real consequences for doing it wrong; ethos lay in doing it right. In all these ways, imperial portrait statues depicted the dedicator as a local benefactor and pious imperial subject. Elsner and Meyer stress that ethos as applied to artworks is in crucial ways about social roles and actions. It took social authority to put up imperial statues, but doing so also demonstrated and strengthened the dedicator’s social persona and credible authority. Ethos was thus profoundly relational; these claims and actions were worked out between the dedicator and other persons and groups in the home city, between the dedicator and the rulers at Rome, between the city and the rulers. Every imperial portrait statue embodied a claim that the dedicator had performed a social good: the ruler was honored, and the local community was bound into the right honorific relationship with the ruler. This claim was action- and situation-specific, relating to the commission and installation of particular statues in particular places, and activated by people’s encounters with those statues in those places. In other words, ethos as expressed through these statues was established by the statues themselves, through their installation and viewing, not through the dedicator’s prior reputation or by a deed separate from the artwork. This in turn added to the credibility and persuasive force of the portraits. If a credible character had dedicated a statue and the proper honorific things were visibly done, then the statue itself became more credible as an honorific image and its subject as praiseworthy. This form of good character lay not in a person’s inner nature but in what he did; character had material and expressive qualities.

Pathos

In the rhetorical model of art developed by Elsner and Meyer, pathos concerns the receptivity of an artwork’s audience and the ways in which that receptivity was shaped.

Pathos is the addressee’s frame of mind, by extension assimilated to the questions the addressee can raise, linked certainly with passions and emotions; but more essentially, it is the locus of problematization, which may be based on anguish, curiosity, anger or joy, whether emotional or intellectual. \(^{56}\)

Pathos, then, relates not only to who saw an artwork but also to how it was seen. This is a valuable concept because of the importance given to the audience and an artwork’s reception from the start of the analysis, usefully countering a focus on only the creators, patrons, or formal aspects of an artwork. Considered in these terms, the audience is understood to shape and even predetermine the making of an artwork, including its form and physical setting—that is, the artwork was made with the audience and with these desired effects in mind. For imperial portrait statues, pathos could relate to the visual

---

\(^{55}\) Rose 1997: cat. 110; Boschung 2002: 173 and n. 1223.

\(^{56}\) This volume, p. XX.
expectations and formal knowledge brought by viewers, their experience of an artwork’s spatial and visual context, and any ritual and other ways that reception was shaped. But Elsner and Meyer push this further; as “the locus of problematization,” pathos connects maker, patron and audience through the artwork. The work takes shape in terms of these connections but also defines them anew in its making and reception. In this sense as well, imperial portrait statuary was profoundly relational. How these statues shaped the audience’s receptivity can be considered under two rough headings: the prior knowledge and expectations of the viewers, and the viewers’ lived experience of the portrait statues. I will explore aspects of the audience’s prior knowledge later, in conjunction with logos; here, I will focus on aspects of the viewer’s experience.

Physical setting played a persuasive role in viewing and reception; pathos was partly a function of where imperial portrait statues were installed, and how they were seen there. Simply put, imperial portrait statues were installed in the most prestigious civic and religious locations. Rose shows that Julio-Claudian portrait groups were overwhelmingly installed in public places. Of his list of 130 groups, 30 come from temple precincts and sanctuaries, mostly within cities. Examples include three groups from the vicinity of the Temple of Athena on the acropolis of Lindos on Rhodes, another from the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus, an installation in front of the west façade of the Parthenon on the Athenian acropolis, and a group installed in the sanctuary of Bel at Palmyra. Temples could be dedicated to imperial figures, presumably with portrait figures as cult statues, as in the Temple of Divus Augustus at Rome, the Temple of Gaius and Lucius at Nemausus, and others. Not all these religious settings were in cities. Julio-Claudian imperial portrait groups were installed in the most prestigious extra-urban sanctuaries as well, for example at Delphi in front of the Temple of Apollo, or, at Olympia, one group probably in front of the Temple of Zeus and another inside the Metroon. Portrait installations in temples and sanctuaries removed the images from the everyday and from casual circulation by appropriating the ritual, dedicatory and festival prestige of sacred places.

Public, urban contexts dominate, however. The portrait of Caligula from Gortyn (fig. 3) was found in the city’s agora, in the same zone as several other Julio-Claudian portraits. Rose has shown that Julio-Claudian statue groups stood in fora or agorai, theaters, basilicae, Augustea or the headquarters of Augustales, and other public buildings. Boschung’s Gens Augusta of 2002 is a contextual exploration of a number of these spaces. Some were built for this purpose, with statues carefully positioned within, as in the probable Augusteum of Rusellae, an apsidal building south of the Forum, or a very similar space at Lucus Feroniae. Some installations drew on the importance and centrality of pre-existing places. A city’s forum or agora was already a central place for political, legal and commercial business, and people went to these places with a strong set

57 These included Gaius Caesar, Livia (?), Tiberius, Antonia Minor (?), and a second portrait of Caligula (Romeo and Portale, cat. nos. 3 – 7; the toga Caligula illustrated here in fig. 3 is their cat. no. 8). Additional, unidentified figures, some quite a bit later in date, were also found in the area (cat. nos. 2, 22, 29, 30, 35, 54, as well as a colossal female figure described on pp. 139-42). Inscriptions from the same zone suggest this was the imperial center of Roman Gortyn: attested are Augustus, Tiberius, Hadrian, (twice), Septimius Severus, Diocletian, Maximian, Constantius Chlorus, and Galerius (Romeo and Portale 1998: 44, n. 115).

of associations, motivations and expectations that in turn shaped the reception of statuary placed there. Just how important placement was is shown by its explicit mention as a local decision and a key part of the honorific gesture, as at Acraeaphia, where the city responded to Nero’s decree of freedom for the Greeks by installing portraits of Nero and Messalina in the Ptoan temple of Apollo and posting the city’s decree in the agora next to the altar of Zeus Soter.\(^59\) In this sense, the placement of imperial portraiture had a dual effect, not only responding to pre-existing concepts of prestige and public space, but in turn also reshaping spatial experiences and expectations.

An imperial portrait statue shaped its audience’s reception also through its juxtaposition with other figures, the physical setting, and the shaping of movement and access to the statue. In groups of portrait statues, interconnections of size, pose and detail could create visual relationships among figures. For example, on the rostra in front of the Temple of Augustus at Leptis Magna, the seated statues of Augustus and Claudius mirrored one another in the reversed positions of their legs; they framed the sculpture visible between and behind them, a quadriga carrying portrait statues of Germanicus and Drusus the Younger (fig. 10).\(^60\) These statues took advantage of their visibility from across the open space of the Forum; they also stood above and removed from the ordinary people who moved through the city’s spaces. In the Metroon at Olympia, imperial portrait statues were installed in at least two phases after the Augustan period, ultimately with three male-female pairs facing each other across the central space (fig. 7).\(^61\) Shared body types and other formal details linked the figures in dynastic relationships, even as they characterized the emperor’s role vis-à-vis the larger world. Claudius, like the colossal portrait just outside (most probably of Augustus), was depicted in the guise of Zeus/Jupiter (fig. 8), while Vespasian and his son Titus wore the garb of military commanders. The retention of Claudius and Agrippina Minor in this group visually claimed continuity between Julio-Claudians and Flavians; overall, the similarities in heights, stances, gestures, turns of the heads, and the women’s clothing unified the group as a whole, even as details of objects held and drapery configurations varied. In addition, carving details show awareness of the viewer: the left side of Claudius’ statue is more carefully carved than the right, suggesting that this side was

\(^{59}\) Rose 1997: cat. 67. Experience could be reframed outside religious and urban centers as well, as in the heightened visual emphasis created by portraits placed on top of an arch over a bridge spanning the Charente river at Mediolanum Santonum, or the case of a statuary group installed on a hill overlooking the harbor at Andriaca, visible to anyone entering the harbor: Rose 1997: cat. 56 and 100.

\(^{60}\) Boschung 2002: 8-21 and Beilage 1 reconstructs these statues’ spatial setting and impact. Hallett adds persuasive comments on how the figures related visually (Hallett 2004: 444). More broadly on visual similarity and difference, Boschung 2002: 192-195.

\(^{61}\) In the Claudian period, statues of Claudius and Agrippina Minor were installed in the Metroon, probably with portrait statues of Tiberius, Livia, Germanicus and Agrippina the Elder. Under Vespasian, the latter four seem to have been replaced with cuirassed statues of Vespasian and Titus, paired with draped female statues probably of Vespasian’s wife and daughter, Domitilla the Elder and Domitilla the Younger. See the summary of these developments at Hitzl 1991: 115-116, with full justifications throughout the monograph. Renate Bol has revised this in one important respect: she shows that the colossal statue of (probably) Augustus most probably did not stand inside the temple but in the open area directly to the south, presiding over this all-important central area of the sanctuary in a way similar to the Augustus statue installed in Athena’s precinct at Pergamon (Bol 2008).
intended to be seen from the entrance. These visual details and placements posed questions for viewers to ask as they looked. Who and what was the Roman emperor? How did he relate to the ruling family, to the sanctuary of Olympia, to human affairs in general, to the gods? At Leptis Magna and Olympia, space and form provided both the questions and their answers.

Constraints on how viewers approached, as well as the shaping of ritual behavior in relation to the statues, were also part of pathos. As noted above, the image of the emperor and the emperor’s actual presence were equivalent under certain circumstances; taking an oath or claiming asylum in the authorizing presence of a statue of the emperor meant that the image shaped human behavior in particular ways. Ritual behaviors requiring images of the emperor strengthened these material and symbolic associations. Two letters written by Ovid from exile on the Black Sea mention images of Augustus and other Julio-Claudian figures installed in his household shrine in Tomis. In this experiential sense, Ovid’s ritual observances at his household shrine are related to the distributions of food at the dedication of a public portrait statue, which tangibly connected the images of the ruling house to pleasurable beneficence. At Gytheum, an annual eight-day festival of the Caesars tied imperial portraits into space, movement and ritual. A procession on each of those eight days, its citizen participants dressed in white, moved from the sanctuary of Asclepius and Hygeia to the theater, with a stop at the Kaisareion to sacrifice a bull. Theater performances then took place in sight of images (in this case apparently paintings) of Augustus, Tiberius and Livia, which had been placed on stage for the occasion. Annual observances enacted these ritual connections through time. In another example, from Forum Clodii in Latium, honey-cakes and wine were handed out every year on the anniversary of the dedication of statues to Augustus, Tiberius and Livia. Ritual and repetition acted on collective memory, framing the portraits as touchstones for social relationships and connections across time and space.

None of this means that viewers were in fact persuaded exactly as the image-makers intended, or that all viewers saw, understood or responded to imperial portraits in the same way. The very act of dedicating a statue created a differentiated viewing, split in the first place between the dedicator (one kind of viewer with a particularly vested interest) and everyone else. Elsner and Meyer make a useful clarification here: “pathos – like ethos and logos – is inherent to the work of art as a kind of directed injunction as to how to view it (in accordance with the wishes of ethos), which of course viewers are at liberty to reject in the same way that a jury may not be persuaded by a given speech.” Viewers brought prior expectations and knowledge to their viewing, and were able to comment on and judge what they saw. This viewing audience was highly trained in the fundamentals of its own visual culture. Repeated exposure to honorific portraiture, to
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64 This is the only group dedication catalogued by Rose in a private context (cat. 124, p. 181): Ovid, Ex Ponto 2.8.1-8, 55-76; 2.9.105-12.
65 Rose 1997: cat. 74, pp. 142-144.
67 This volume, p. XX.
images of the emperor, to rituals and behaviors concerning the emperor and imperial house, will have made many people—especially in the Empire’s cities and sanctuaries—highly aware of how these visual representations worked. Accordingly, imperial portrait statuary did not take chances with viewing and reception. Perhaps for this reason, as a corpus it is characterized by immense conservatism: the fixity of portrait types, the use of standard conventions over and over, the widespread repetition of certain images, names, titles, figural juxtapositions. The key point is that, in this way, the possibilities of response were constrained, even if they could not be fully predetermined. The imperial portrait in its most complete sense, including its contexts and circumstances of viewing, constructed certain avenues of acceptance or rejection, and not others. Viewers’ responses were not singular, homogenous or even predictable, but they were carefully channeled along certain lines.

**Logos**

The third means of persuasion, *logos*, concerns the message itself, the construction of the argument. In Elsner’s and Meyer’s formulation, logos is “any medium by which an audience is addressed” as well as “any performative aspect of address.” Aspects of an artwork can of course work in terms of two or more of these forms of persuasion, and in the discussion below, logos will prove to be interwoven with pathos. Still, it is helpful to think about logos in imperial portrait statues, to assume the statements made were persuasive rather than indicative in nature. To put all this another way, we might say the artwork itself raises a question or poses a problem for viewers; without one, why should anyone pay attention? At the same time, it also answers the question and solves the problem. In this light, fundamental questions raised by imperial portrait statues—especially in regard to a diverse and empire-wide viewing audience—might include: who is the emperor? What is an emperor? How does the emperor relate to concepts and practices of power? How does the audience, in its diverse social groupings, relate to the emperor? Groupings of statuary had, among other advantages over a solitary portrait, the ability to raise and answer more complex versions of these questions. Considered in terms of logos, then, imperial portrait statues had to persuade a very wide range of viewers not only that these were the important questions but also that the answers provided were believable and true. Many aspects of imperial portrait statuary could be considered in relation to logos and the analysis of how these arguments were made. Here I will focus on just two: the role of visual conventions and the role of repetition.

Imperial portrait statuary constructed its visual arguments primarily by following strong visual conventions. The configuration of imperial portrait statuary worked in terms of viewers’ prior knowledge and expectations, meaning that the content of the visual argument went hand in hand with its shaping of the audience’s perceptions. As already noted, it participated in a visual tradition of honorific portraiture even as it became a major shaping force within that tradition; although the corpus of imperial portrait statuary had unique features (e.g. some colossal portraits, the use of red porphyry
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68 This volume, p. XX.
69 Some of the most fruitful work on Julio-Claudian imperial portraiture in recent decades has been on dynastic groups, esp. Rose 1997 and Boschung 2002 (though with very different emphases).
later on), for the most part these portraits often shared with non-imperial honorific male portraits the most standard sizes, materials, and body types. For our purposes this means that most viewers of imperial portrait statues, through long and frequent exposure, could probably grasp the basic nature of any such statue at first glance, whether or not they saw or understood every iconographic detail. Any new statue immediately signaled, by virtue of its size, material, combination of individualized head and stock body, accompanying inscription, and often its setting as well, that this was an honorific portrait statue. Who and what was the emperor? First and foremost, apparently, he was a figure deserving of honor. Every portrait statue claimed this by its very existence, tangible evidence that someone had in fact honored the ruler in this form. For the viewer, the specific details of a statue then progressively elaborated on that initial visual impact.

For example, the togated statue of Caligula from the Agora of Gortyn (fig. 3) is immediately recognizable as an honorific portrait. It was carved in a standard material, marble, to a typical height, 2.05m. The figure stands in a typical pose for honorific statuary, with his weight on the left leg and the right slightly bent. He wears the toga, which in the West would describe him simply as a Roman citizen, but here in the Greek East probably denoted a Roman magistrate. The statue depicts him capite velato, with a fold of the toga pulled over his head to show that he is performing a religious function; his right arm almost certainly originally held a patera for pouring a libation. This is a standard body and pose for the portrait of a Roman citizen performing a religious ritual, but the individualized and recognizable head (together with the associated inscription, if there was one) activates a more specific meaning. It marks this statue as a portrait of the emperor Caligula, in his religious office as pontifex maximus. More broadly, it connects this individual ruler to a crucial symbolic role of the Roman emperor: pietas, the emperor’s religious observance and care for the Roman state’s right relationship with the gods.

Scholars have identified repeated allegorical themes in visual depictions of the Roman emperor. Depictions in armor, for example, relate the current ruler, a time-specific individual, to the broader, timeless concept of imperial virtus, or military ability and courage successfully deployed on behalf of Rome. Reliefs and other narrative scenes, with their increased scope for figural interactions in space, can more fully express additional important imperial virtues such as clementia, the restraint and mercy properly shown to conquered peoples, or concordia, harmony within the imperial house and hence the all-important stability of the succession, and so on. In this way, individual imperial portrait statues were part of a much larger web of signification. Each one identified a need (e.g. for pietas Augusti) and at the same time demonstrated it being fulfilled. Who and what was the emperor? The statue of Caligula from Gortyn portrays the emperor
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70 Usually marble or bronze. Colossal size, precious metals, or a gilded surface created a visual and sensual distinction between viewers and the emperor portrayed, which also worked in terms of pathos.

71 Havé Nikolaus 2000: 20-21. Recently, traces of purple were discovered on the chest of this statue, just inside the right shoulder, meaning the statue could be reconstructed as wearing the toga praetexta, the toga purpurea, or the toga purpurea with gilt embroidered edges (digitalarthistory.weebly.com/uploads/6/9/4/3/6943163/frischer_getty_final_digital_sculpture_project.pdf, accessed July 16, 2012). Its visual impact and meaning will have been significantly different depending on the overall color.

72 Niemeyer 1968: 43-47.
both in terms of the need for a figure who can and will enact piety on behalf of the state, and as the figure who does in fact enact piety on behalf of the state.

Repetition was a second central characteristic of the persuasive force of imperial portraiture. The same viewers often saw the same statues repeatedly, but much more important in this sense was the sheer ubiquity of imperial representations. This was perhaps the most striking difference between imperial and non-imperial portrait statues. Only the emperors, and to a lesser extent their family members, were represented over and over again around the Empire, on coins, in paintings, cameos and other media, and in statuary. Starting with Augustus, portrait types were established for the heads, i.e. centrally created and authorized versions of the ruler’s facial features and hairstyle, which were in turn copied all over the Empire. Not every new portrait statue faithfully reproduced the most current head type, but the overall result was to impose a striking overall degree of uniformity and recognizability on representations of the emperor’s face and hair. For many viewers, looking at a statue could mean immediate recognition of the features and hairstyle of Augustus, or Caligula, or whoever the case might be. Who was the emperor? He was the most repeated person in the empire, the man whose head was portrayed over and over again on coins, in portrait statues and other media. Imperial portrait statuary was not only about authoritative representation but also authoritative repetition.

This feature allowed even the overwhelmingly honorific medium of portraiture effectively to produce some measure of blame as well as praise over time. The ubiquity of imperial portraiture in different media created a very widespread visual literacy; most people never saw the emperor in person, but almost everyone saw images of him. Any one portrait both drew meaning from this broader landscape of visual repetition and contributed to it in turn. This ubiquity and recognition take on heightened significance over time. The sculpted images of Augustus are estimated to have numbered in the tens of thousands, and many will have remained on view long after his death (fig. 5, 6, 7 and 10). As already seen in the Metron at Olympia and in the Forum at Leptis Magna, they sometimes became essential elements of later rulers’ public representation. By contrast, a short-lived or undistinguished princeps, or one who suffered what modern scholars have termed damnatio memoriae, ended up with a far smaller number of surviving portrait statues in the longer term. In this way, the tangible, lived aspects of imperial portraits could construct praise and blame for the emperor’s memory through relative frequency or absence in public space.

Similarly, the stock body of a portrait statue worked rhetorically through repetition—but along a different set of visual and symbolic axes. These body types had other sources, distribution mechanisms, and uses; they were not centrally designed or distributed, but could often be used for many different individuals, private and even mythological as well as imperial. For example, portrait heads of Augustus were
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73 New portrait types could be created during an emperor’s reign; see Boschung 1987, 1993 and 2002: 180-198. On the distribution of these portrait types, Pfanner 1989.
74 Gregory 1994 on the political receptions of mainly Late Republican portraits and other images; Stewart 2003: ch. 8 on the various things that could happen to Roman statues; Varner 2004 on damnatio memoriae and portraiture.
75 Trimble 2011: ch. 4. It should be noted that the rule of individualized head combined with stock body was most consistently true for male portraiture. For women, stock bodies were also the norm, but the head’s relationship to individualization was different. See also Dillon 2010.
combined with a wide range of stock bodies: wearing military garb, in the toga, nude or semi-nude with a mantle, in the “Diomedes” type, or seated in the pose of a ruler or Jupiter, and so on (e.g. fig. 5, 6, 7, 10).76 For Augustus and his successors, these stock bodies delivered straightforward meanings whose simplicity and repetitive force helped make them intelligible across a vast and diverse Empire. What was the emperor? Depending on the circumstances, a citizen, a magistrate, a priest, a military commander, a hero, a god. Head and body worked together accordingly. Imperial portraits made claims not about how an emperor actually looked but about how this particular emperor (recognizable by the head) fulfilled the role of emperor (recognizable through the formulaic clothing, gesture, any attributes carried).77

It is through this repetition that head types and stock bodies formed the building blocks for more complex meanings expressed very locally, within specific situations of place, event or identity. As noted above for Olympia and Leptis Magna, the juxtaposition of portrait statues of different rulers, with similar or different formulaic bodies, could build up visual arguments about legitimacy, hierarchy, and dynastic relationships (fig. 7 and 10). But even as the princeps’ extraordinary status was created through these specific sculptural, epigraphic and spatial relationships, the local features of who dedicated a statue, where it was placed, and what kinds of ritual encounters were staged around it built up arguments about local social relations and desired behavior, and linked those local relationships to a wider world. Every new imperial statue dedication was an intervention into local power dynamics and constructions of meaning; installing any imperial portrait statue claimed a certain set of relationships among local social groups as well as with the emperor. The physical nature of an imperial portrait statue in actual space made possible an embodied rhetoric. At the same time, formula, sameness and repetition made this reproducible on an empire-wide scale. In sum, at stake in imperial portrait statuary was a rhetorical repetition and amplification, acting on a far-flung and extremely diverse audience throughout the empire.

The rhetoric of appearance in Suetonius and in portrait statuary

Thinking rhetorically about imperial portrait statues offers several benefits, including help with the problem posed at the start of this paper: how to understand Suetonius’ descriptions and imperial portrait statuary in relation to one another. This in turn allows a different set of relationships between the two to emerge, one that avoids both the impossibility of direct comparison and the pessimism of abandoning the attempt altogether.

One benefit of drawing on Elsner’s and Meyer’s rhetorical framework is that it allows makers, patrons, artworks and viewers to be fundamentally interrelated throughout the analysis. In Elsner’s and Meyer’s words: “to understand the work of art as rhetoric is to grasp its discursive function as a mediating tool between a series of addressers – commissioners, patrons, artists, who in their different ways constitute an ethos – and an audience of viewers, a pathos.”78 Viewing and reception are incorporated from the

77 On this concept, and how it changed in late antique imperial portraits: Smith 1985.
78 This volume, p. XX.
beginning, rather than treated as separate and unknowable phenomena that happened well after the carving and installation. This rhetorical model allows a more integrated consideration of a statue’s audience and reception, and of the ways in which form, context, and persuasion were shaped and perceived. In this way, thinking rhetorically about these images offers a unifying framework. It brings into relationship aspects of imperial portrait statuary that are often individually well understood, e.g. sculptural technique, portrait types, patronage, and spatial context, but that have been less fully considered in terms of their interconnections.

Second, thinking about these portraits in terms of ethos, pathos and logos makes persuasion central to these images. In this view, imperial portrait statues were not simply one-dimensional gestures of political loyalty, nor did they work as one-directional political propaganda, serving only the interests of the imperial house. Discussing artworks in terms of ethos, pathos and logos makes it possible to think also about the interactions of spatial context, visual form, and socio-political relations; it establishes these statues as fundamentally relational, connecting people and images in lived space. Communication is one way to describe this functioning of the statues, but persuasion may be a more productive concept, focusing our attention more sharply on what was at stake and on the interests and constraints of the different parties involved.

For the purposes of this paper, a third benefit of this rhetorical approach is that it helps explain the strange disjunction with which I began. My discussion has emphasized that there is no direct way to match up the physical descriptions of rulers in Suetonius’ Twelve Caesars and the way portrait statues represent the same men. Yet the question remains: how did these apparently irreconcilable claims about the emperor’s appearance make sense within the same society and even with overlapping audiences?79 On the one hand, emphasizing the rhetorical aspects of Suetonius’ descriptions and the portrait statuary has underlined how very different these two media were: the forms, emphases and even particular details of these texts and images took shape in terms of their respective media and genres, with very different conventions, goals and audience expectations in play. On the other hand, taking these differences seriously under the rubric of rhetorical persuasion allows other kinds of interconnections to appear.

A strong connecting theme is that a single conception of how the ruler actually looked was simply not in play. Juxtaposing Suetonius and portrait statuary is a powerful reminder of how culturally specific concepts of likeness actually are. How people frame physical descriptions, and what people see in physical descriptions, is not a universal but culturally and situationally embedded.80 Likeness is a set of traits declared to represent a person in some important way, but what that means can vary with the context, the

79 The audiences for Suetonius and imperial portrait statuary were not identical; Suetonius wrote in the early second century, while the portrait statues of the first century rulers were made primarily during those reigns (though many still stood during the second century). Suetonius’ work may have been best known at Rome, while portrait statuary was installed around the Empire. At the same time, there will have been overlap in these audiences; anyone familiar with Suetonius’ work had surely also seen visual portraits of those rulers.

80 Bowersock 1991 emphasizes that approaches to the self and personhood are not the same cross-culturally; Rohrbacher 2010 makes a similar point. Sheila Dillon, in her study of “anonymous” portraits of Greek philosophers, highlights the cultural contingency of individual appearance from a different angle, criticizing the modern fetishization of likeness and the dismissal of works that are clearly portraits but that are not linked to a specific name (Dillon 2006: 1).
Tiberius’ mannerisms were intentional (character while speaking Tiberius’ posture while walking and the unpleasant “supple movement of his fingers” seem to have like the sudden eruption of pimples (portrait, treatment). No matter how lifelike a painted or carved human likeness cannot be compared to determine what the Augustus, Caligula or Vespasian actually looked like; neither body of work was intended to depict a ruler’s singular, actual appearance, or worked in terms of that concept. Instead, both Suetonius’ descriptions and portrait statuary—in very different ways—were persuasive in intent and construction. Appearance was not a fixed or essential concept; these texts and images instead allow us to see the malleability and expressive capacities of physical description.

With these strong differences and capacities in mind, we may be able to see ways in which text and image worked in awareness of one another. For example, as already noted, Augustus’ “crab claw” locks over the forehead were a consistent element of many of his visual portraits (fig. 5 and 6). Apparently they were recognized as such, or at least carved with the expectation that they would be recognized. This feature is directly contradicted by Suetonius: “he was so far from being particular about the dressing of his hair, that he would have several barbers working in a hurry at the same time” (in capite comendo tam incuriosus, ut raptim compluribus simul tonsoribus operam daret; Aug. 79). Suetonius’ text does not simply represent a different hairstyle but claims that Augustus had no hairstyle at all, and in fact resisted careful grooming. It is possible that this counterpoint was deliberate, a difference that marked a biographical separation from the longstanding, most widely known, formulaic depictions of the first princeps in statuary.

In another Suetonian example, Caligula’s clothing dramatically flouts appropriate categories and occasions. He is said to have worn women’s clothing, bodyguards’ clothing, gods’ clothing, and even triumphator’s clothing before the relevant military campaign had even begun (Gaius 52). All these ways of dressing wrong make peculiar sense in relation to the visual representations. In his carved portraits, Caligula’s clothing is not only appropriate and unexceptionable (fig. 3 and 4), but was presumably repeated over and over again as appropriate and unexceptionable through the canonical use of stock body types, as was standard for any emperor. Here, the written emphasis on Caligula’s lack of (sartorial) restraint and propriety may have gained all the more force from its pointed contrast to the visual sobriety and fixity of what emperors normally wore in the images most people saw. To put this another way, in a visual culture of formulaic and carefully constrained imperial representations, an emperor’s general excesses could be specifically evoked in terms of their distance from those very formulae.

This possible awareness across text and image lends significance to Suetonius’ treatment of movement and mannerisms. No matter how lifelike a painted or carved portrait, it obviously cannot evoke a man’s bad smell (Nero 51) or temporary afflictions like the sudden eruption of pimples (Tib. 68). By contrast, movement and mannerisms seem to have played an especially important role in Suetonius’ physical descriptions. Tiberius’ posture while walking and the unpleasant “supple movement of his fingers” while speaking (molli quadam digitorum gesticulatione) are presented as indicative of his character (Tib. 68). Augustus tried to explain them away as “natural failings and not intentional” (naturae vitia esse, non animi), but apparently this was not persuasive; Tiberius’ mannerisms were instead seen as “disagreeable and signs of arrogance”

---

81 Boschung discusses Caligula’s clothing, though with different emphases (1989: 73-79).
These mannerisms, and the malleability of their interpretation, take on added resonance against the visual backdrop of statues of Tiberius that, by definition, would have characterized him in terms of perfectly agreeable posture and monumental stillness.

Most striking in this sense is Suetonius’ description of Claudius. He “possessed majesty and dignity of appearance, but only when he was standing still or sitting, and especially when he was lying down” (auctoritas dignitasque formae non defuit ei, verum stanti vel sedenti ac praeceptique quiescenti)—in other words, when he most resembled a portrait statue. In motion, he was the very opposite of an honorific representation. Besides a stammer and a constantly shaking head, “his laughter was unseemly and his anger still more disgusting, for he would foam at the mouth and trickle at the nose” (risus indecens, ira turpior spumante rictu, umentibus naribus; Claudius 30). As an illustrative contrast, the statue of Claudius from the Metroon at Olympia, like his famous portrait from Lanuvium, combined an individualized head with a body in the guise of Jupiter (fig. 8). The statue powerfully materialized Claudius as ruler by distancing the image from physical traits of exactly the kind emphasized in Suetonius. Written and visual representation become counterpoints: a timeless image vs. intermittent events, a represented body vs. the lived body, a fixed appearance in the statuary vs. tics and illness in the text. In Suetonius, this very opposition is what encapsulates Claudius’ contradictory aspects; his foolish appearance and confidence-eroding mannerisms belied a surprisingly effective reign. Visual imagery here is a valuable resource. Claudius was a good and successful ruler inasmuch as he resembled imperial portrait statues, but that genre’s monumentality and fixity was not undercut or contradicted through this parallel. They were instead employed as one pole of meaning to which an important aspect of Claudius’ life and deeds, the successful aspects of his rule, could be vividly and comprehensibly linked.

In short, Suetonius’ descriptions seem to play with the possibilities of portrait statuary as a backdrop, a competing claim about the ruler, a starting point for meaningful contradiction and texture. His descriptions evoke a world of statues but also a self-conscious competition across genres. Conversely, imperial portrait statuary may have developed partly in awareness of spoken and written forms of description. The tremendous conservatism and fixity of honorific imperial statuary, with its endlessly repeated portrait head types and stock bodies, surely conferred—or attempted to confer—a valuable stability of meaning. In a world of malleable and rhetorical verbal descriptions of appearance, any deviation or room for alternative interpretation could be exploited in unpredictable and potentially dangerous ways. In this sense, imperial portrait statuary performed its own policing. There was no guarantee of how viewers would receive a given portrait, or that an established portrait type would be properly replicated across the empire. However, the establishment of portrait types, the extraordinary emphasis on repetition across time and space, and the conventions of honorific portraiture strengthened this statuary’s persuasive claims, helped constrain reception along strongly shaped channels, and bolstered the possibility of an honorific
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82 Stok points out that Augustus’ argument complicates a simple physiognomic reading of Suetonius’ physical descriptions (Stok 1995).
83 Gleason 1995.
outcome. It is exactly this fixity that Suetonius’ descriptions occasionally seem to play with and even unravel.

Suetonius’ descriptions and imperial portrait statues both use physical description to connect how the ruler looked to what he did in the world. Appearance, and the audience’s expectations about appearance, could be worked with and shaped to create different effects and responses. In this sense, both the statuary and Suetonius’ descriptions recall Lenin’s embalmed body, with its elaborate construction of a “lifelike” appearance. As with Lenin’s corpse, how the Roman ruler was portrayed to his subjects was ultimately a question of politics, context and an embodied rhetoric.
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